

Appl. No. 09/844,658  
Reply to Office action of November 14, 2005  
Page 2

## REMARKS

In the above referenced office action, the Examiner argues that the rejection is properly maintained due to the manner in which the Examiner was reading the references. Specifically, that the Faisander programmer was "deployable" and could interface with any manufactures implantable device. Thus, the Examiner interprets this to cover "multiple types of medical device interface instruments."

Applicant respectfully disagrees with this analysis. Claim 1, for example specifically states that there are a body of software components having standardized interfaces to medical device interface instruments and IMDs (implantable medical devices). Thus, the Implanted devices are specifically distinguished from the interface devices. The hardware module (external) is claimed as being deployable to multiple types of interface instruments; not multiple IMDs or multiple types of IMDs. Thus, Applicant's earlier argument is correct and the references only teach a single interface instrument, namely a programmer.

"[A]ny implant from any manufacture" does not fairly or accurately teach multiple interface instruments which are specifically distinguished from IMDs in the claim language itself. As such, the rejection is improper and must be withdrawn.

Applicant asserts that the claims are in condition for allowance and requests notice of the same.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/17/06



Daniel G. Chapik  
Reg. 43,424  
Telephone: (763) 514-3066  
Customer No. 27581